



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ART. II.—1. *Philosophy of the Human Voice, embracing its Physiological History; together with a System of Principles by which Criticism in the Art of Elocution may be rendered Intelligible, and Instruction Definite and Comprehensive. To which is added a brief Analysis of Song and Recitative.* By JAMES RUSH, M. D. Philadelphia. 1827. J. Maxwell.

2. *Analysis of the Principles of Rhetorical Delivery, as applied to Reading and Speaking.* By EBENEZER PORTER, D. D., Bartlet Professor of Sacred Rhetoric in the Theological Seminary, Andover. 1827. Mark Newman.

WE take all due shame to ourselves, that two works on Elocution, like those now before us, should have remained so long unnoticed in our pages. We have thought it singular, and we are willing to confess our share in the fault, that works as creditable to our literature as these are, and in a department of knowledge, which, as matters now stand, is positively of greater importance to the body of our scholars than any other, should have been ushered into the world without receiving a hearty welcome from any leading Journal among us. The Rev. Dr Porter's book, we perceive, has been suffered quietly to slide into a second edition; and from that circumstance we presume it is gaining, unpraised and unnoticed, the estimation it deserves among our Academies and Colleges. As to Dr Rush's work, we venture to say that not one in a hundred of our literary men has ever read it, or known anything about it.

We have in these suggestions struck the key-note; but the *strain* of our complaints is yet to come. It is a small matter, comparatively, that these books on Elocution have been neglected in our Journals, or by our scholars. The great evil is the evil *indicated* by this fact. The great evil is, that the subject itself has fallen into neglect. The art of Rhetorical Delivery is regarded with a more amazing and unaccountable indifference among us than ever befell any other art, in circumstances so apparently favorable to its cultivation. This, and nothing but this, accounts for the fact adverted to. One of the works, in question, it is true, is only a Manual, and might not be thought to crave much discussion. But the other is a stout octavo on the Philosophy of the Human Voice. An analysis of the voice, in many respects novel, and running through

more than five hundred pages, is a pretty serious matter. It must be a very weak production, indeed, to deserve to fall into utter neglect. If such a work,—a work of such size and pretensions, of whatever character, had been thrown out among the ancient rhetoricians, we imagine that they would have turned it over, and handled it, till they made something of it. But now, if we should please to assert that this work of Dr Rush surpasses all that the ancients have done,—surpasses all the rhetorical works in the world; we presume, that not one in a hundred of our scholars and public speakers, could give any good reason for contradicting us.

Our plan is, first, to take notice of these publications, and, then, to offer some remarks on the general neglect of elocution among us, the want of good speaking, and the almost absolute futility of the common methods, devised for its improvement.

We confess our obligations to the distinguished gentleman, at the head of the Andover Institution (as we understand, according to a late arrangement of the officers), for the popular and most valuable treatise on ‘the Principles of Rhetorical Delivery,’ which he has presented to the public. We are obliged, we do not say to his condescension,—for we hold that to descend to labors like these, is to *rise*; but to the well known professional zeal, which, amidst ill health and the arduous duties of his station, has given us a work, evidently requiring much thought and attention. It is, beyond all comparison, the best work of the kind, that has appeared in our language. We do not now bring it into any comparison with Austin’s *Chironomia*, which is too elaborate and expensive for common use; and in the department which forms its principal distinction from other rhetorical works, that of action, too artificial, perhaps, to be safe as a manual. It were to be wished, by the by, that half a dozen copies of this work were placed in all our college libraries. Sheridan’s and Steele’s works had, and have, their value; but they are too speculative, and go too much into detail, for the purpose now in view. The same may be said of Walker’s *Elocution*; though a great advance on previous undertakings, yet characterized by something of the vagueness and obscurity, and what now seems to us the unnecessary minuteness, incident to the investigation and establishment of new principles. Rome was not built in a day, and those who rebuild and improve, often do it out of the hard-wrought works of their predecessors. Campbell’s invaluable ‘*Philosophy of Rhetoric*,’ which is, in-

deed, the philosophy of language with reference to its rhetorical uses, does not fall within the range of our present comparison.

We consider Dr Porter's work, therefore, as supplying a most material deficiency in our works on Elocution ; and it is in all respects exactly what was wanted. The 'Analysis of Principles,' is sufficiently philosophic, and yet very practical. It is a condensed summary ; the work, manifestly of an experienced hand, the result of much observation ; clear, judicious, and discriminating. We have read, and re-read the whole, and can find no fault with it. We did, indeed, venture to question whether some of the 'exercises on inflection,' given to illustrate the fifth rule on that head, did not more properly belong to the ninth ; and we suppose that there is some 'debateable ground' between these rules. *Where* 'the sense is suspended ;' and what *constitutes* 'an emphatic succession of particulars,'—questions which determine whether the rising, or the falling inflection should be used, may in some cases be a matter of doubt. But the more we have examined these exercises, which occupy more than half of the volume, the more we have found it hazardous to dissent from so respectable an authority. We have only to add that the style of this work, that is, of the original part, is admirable ; and that those who have had the pleasure of listening to Dr Porter as a preacher, will meet here with the simplicity, perspicuity, and elegance, together with the pith and energy of expression, with which he is wont to deliver himself. More we might say, and strongly say, if it were proper, of the rhetorical qualifications of this gentleman, for the task he has fulfilled ; but lest praise should become intrusion, we leave the subject ; again expressing our hearty thanks to Dr Porter, for a work, which, however simple in its character and claims, we are satisfied will do more to raise the tone of speaking in our academies and colleges than anything else that has issued from our press.

We turn now from this manual of 'the Principles of Rhetorical Delivery,' to the much larger and more elaborate work on a single branch of the subject, the 'Philosophy of the Human Voice.'

This, we do not hesitate to say, is the most important department in the whole science of oratory. The voice is the principal organ of the soul ; it is that by which the mind first and immediately pours forth its thoughts. Articulate speech is

the grand instrument of the orator ; the most accurate, flexible, delicate, exquisite, and powerful. It is from this, that eloquence derives its name. We can bear any defect in a speaker, better than a bad, or a badly modulated voice ; none so directly interferes with the just and forcible expression of his thoughts. We dwell upon this a moment, partly for the sake of inviting attention to the importance of the subject which Dr Rush has chosen for his essay ; and partly because it is not an uncommon idea, that *gesture* is the principal thing to be taught in our courses of rhetorical instruction. We believe that the cultivation of the voice is entitled to this preëminence, as, at once, the most essential, the most difficult, and the most practicable of all the labors of the rhetorician. It is the most practicable at the same time that it is the most difficult, because while, on the one hand, no man ever became a perfect reader without much practice and deep study, on the other, no one ever failed to improve his voice by daily and careful practice. This is more than can be said of *gesture*, which depends much on the general manners of the speaker ; whereas to cultivate the voice requires nothing but sense, feeling, and patient study. And yet nothing, much as it has been studied both in ancient and modern times, has been the subject of so many vague ideas and descriptions, as the human voice.

But, not to wander too far from our object, we return to the essay before us. We have had some difficulty in deciding what course to pursue in presenting this work to the notice of our readers. But we have not been long in determining that we cannot find space for any minute criticism on the work. We cannot let our readers far into the mysteries of its nomenclature and notation. We cannot go much into detail, in reviewing a book of details. Almost every page is crowded with discriminations, requiring more deliberation and experiment than we are wont to solicit for our own pages ; if it were possible, indeed, to find place in them for discussions of this nature. We shall endeavor, therefore, to give such a notice of this treatise as may, we hope, induce others to read it, rather than attempt to supply them with an abstract so full as to lead them to think a perusal of it unnecessary. We read it with great satisfaction. We considered it as going far beyond any former analysis of the voice. It is from an honest and hearty impulse, therefore, that we recommend it to others ;—not having read the book, to review it, but reviewing it because we have read it.

Of all subjects for philosophical analysis, Dr Rush has taken up the most difficult. This arises from the flexible, variable, vanishing nature of the voice. It is ever changing. It does not stand still to be the object of attention. It does not pause to be listened to. He who hunts in this field, to use the huntsman's phrase, must 'shoot flying.' It is like examining objects which pass swiftly before the eye, and almost instantly vanish from sight; making it nearly impossible on both accounts to distinguish them. And, indeed, the only method of examining the voice, is artificially to lengthen out or prolong its tones; just as we should cause the object of vision in the case just supposed, if we wish to examine it, to move more slowly or to pause before our eyes. It is for this reason, that the singing voice is more easily analyzed, and has been so much more accurately defined. It is not a continuous flow of sound, but it skips from note to note, pausing upon each one, and giving time for the listener to mark and describe it. The speaking voice is like a stream; the observer perceives, that there are undulations in it, that it rises or falls, that its current is stronger or feebler, that its sound is higher or lower; but all minuter discrimination is lost in its continual flow.

Observations of this sort, indeed, pursued, not into detailed and accurate descriptions, but into more vague diffuseness, are by all that we obtain from the ancients. Julius Pollux, as quoted by Austin, enumerates (Lib. II. c. 4.) no less than thirty-seven qualities of voice. Our readers may be curious to know what they are. The following is the catalogue; high, powerful, clear, extensive, deep, brilliant, pure, sweet, attractive, melodious, persuasive, tractable, flexible, executive, mellow, sonorous, distinct, perspicuous, obscure, dull, unpleasing, small, thin, faint, indistinct, confused, discordant, unharmonious, unmanageable, not fitted to persuade, rigid, harsh, cracked, doleful, hoarse, brassy, shrill. 'What can be more wonderful,' says Mr Walker in a note to his Observations on the Greek and Latin Accent, 'than that, among so many of the ancients who have written on the causes of eloquence, and who have descended to such trifling and childish observations upon the importance of letters and syllables, we should not find a single author who has taken notice of the importance of emphasis upon a *single* word? Our modern books of elocution abound with instances of the change produced in the sense of a sentence by changing the place of the emphasis; but no such instance appears among the an-

cients. Not one poor *Will you ride to town to-day?* And yet they labored over the voice, they sent it to school, they had masters for it, they prescribed diet and a course of life for it, forbidding figs, apples, pears, nuts, gross eating, much wine, and especially, ‘*Veneris damnosa voluptas,*’ and requiring moderation, early rising, exercise, &c.—all which, by the by, we suppose, amounts to this, that to the cultivation of a good voice, good health is usually necessary.

The ancients understood the rising and falling inflections, and that circumflex, which consists of the rise and fall of the voice on the same syllable. To these, Mr Walker claims the honor of adding that circumflex which is the reverse of the old Greek circumflex, which consists, that is, of a fall and rise of the voice on the same note; and this, together with the application of these inflections, and some discrimination of the alphabetic elements, has hitherto been the extent of philosophical analysis, among modern inquirers. It may be asked, what other conditions in the movement of the voice there can be than its monotone, its rising, its falling, its rising and falling, or falling and rising on the same syllable? None certainly; but then, there are species to be sought for under these genera. For instance, the voice not only rises, but it rises through semitones, tones, seconds, thirds, fifths, and eighths on the musical scale; and these transitions are appropriated to various sentiments, the semitone to the plaintive, the tone to ordinary emotions, the third to more earnest, and so on. It is with discriminations like these, that a part of Dr Rush’s work is occupied. In the same manner he traces the descent of the voice through the several intervals of the scale. He, then, applies a similar process of investigation to the circumflex, which he denominates ‘the wave of the voice.’ He not only perceives a rising and falling tone or the reverse, on the same syllable, as others have done, but he finds that it rises or sinks, higher or lower, through various intervals, each having its peculiar expression; and moreover, that it executes this movement by unequal intervals, sinking lower for instance than the note with which it commenced; a circumflex, or ‘wave,’ expressive of the highest degree of scorn. We cannot go farther into particulars; but this notice of what they may find will induce our readers we hope, to look into these chapters for themselves.

Dr Rush has taken up all the qualities of the voice, and ap-

plied to them the same minute analysis. Words have not only force, as a quality of sound, but the stress may be applied at the beginning, the middle, or the end, or throughout ; or it may be compound, being laid at the beginning and the end ; or it may be a particular loudness on one syllable, to distinguish it from the rest. On emphasis, again, we have the same, and many more distinctions. The quality of the voice, time, accent,—in short, most of its rhetorical characteristics have sections devoted to them, in which the object is not to lay down rules and definitions, but to investigate the principles which govern the voice, in these various respects. There are sections also upon other powers and conditions of the voice, which are new in rhetoric, or invested with new importance ; as upon ‘Aspiration,’ one of the most powerful elements of sound ; on ‘the Tremor of the voice,’ a quality somewhere between its ordinary sound, and laughter or crying, and proper to the most impassioned language of either joyous or distressful emotion ; on ‘the Drift of the voice,’ which is its general and prevalent tone, with reference to the leading sentiment of a discourse or part of a discourse ; and on ‘the Grouping of speech,’ or the skilful mangement of the voice in such a manner as to show the bearing and connexion of the different clauses in a sentence. We cannot, in consistency with the further views we have in this article, follow Dr Rush into that detail on these several heads which is necessary to do his thoughts any justice. And, in truth, we are more desirous, if it were in our power, to excite curiosity, than to gratify it. For we repeat the expression of our earnest desire that this work may be much better known.

We cannot help bearing testimony to the spirit of thorough philosophy, and to the evidences of patient and acute observation, which are everywhere manifest in this very curious and original production. We do not profess to have entered very deeply into this *new science*, for in the hands of our author it is new ; but allowing for such differences as will arise where the ear is consulted, we yield our full assent to his general principles. We particularly recommend the long sections on ‘the Mode of Instruction in Elocution,’ and on ‘the Faults of Readers,’ to all those who have any thorough interest in this subject. The section on ‘Syllabication,’ in an early part of the work, is a fine argument. And if any one would take account of articulate sounds, from an ear that seems to have listened to nature as few ears have listened, we would advise him to read the third section, on ‘the Alphabetic Elements.’

After all, we have had our fears, from the first, that this work would not be much read. It is too profound, for that leisure reading, commonly assigned to books on rhetoric. He who erects an art into a science, and calls for a new style of thinking, for a novel application of the mind, on any subject, must wait with patience for the 'hearing ear.' The intrinsic difficulty of the inquiry is a still greater obstacle to its obtaining the necessary attention. It is this that deters most men from the study of the mind. But the voice is a more impracticable and evanescent subject for philosophy. The mind has states, at least; but the voice has no condition but that of impulse and immediate vanishing into nothing. The new nomenclature in this essay will be apt to discourage readers. Indeed, it gives an aspect of novelty to things that are not new. As for instance, what is Dr Rush's 'radical and vanishing movement,' but a rising or falling inflection? If he had oftener stated, how far the books of rhetoric, or its received principles, accompanied him in this inquiry, he would have saved an indolent reader from the appalling difficulties of entering upon what seems to him an entirely new field, and an attentive one from the depreciating feeling, that very obvious matters are made mysterious by the new garb in which they are clothed. And, indeed, we think that there are decided faults in the work, which interfere with its success. There is a tone of contempt toward all former writers on rhetoric, not very conciliating to those who have hitherto taken them for masters and guides. The style, too, is often involved and obscure, and, it seems to us, unnecessarily singular and technical, however new are the thoughts to be exhibited. In fine, we cannot commend the manner of this performance, as we cordially do the matter. Dr Rush has not patience. If we had said, modesty, it would have been more than we chose to say; but there are many passages which have an air of haughtiness and self-complacency, that are not needed in a work so capable of resting on its own merits as this.

What will be the effects of this 'Philosophical Analysis,' we venture not to predict. We wish that we could see a grammar of rhetoric, formed on its principles. In the close of his essay on Greek and Latin accent, Mr Walker has the following language. 'But till the human voice, which is the same in all ages and nations, is more studied and better understood, and till a notation of speaking sounds is adopted, I despair of

conveying my ideas of this subject with sufficient clearness upon paper. I have, however, marked such an outline as may be easily filled up by those who study speaking with half the attention they must do music. From an entire conviction that the ancients had a notation of speaking sounds, and from the actual experience of having formed one myself, I think I can foresee, that some future philosophical inquirer, with more learning, more leisure, and more credit with the world than I have, will be able to unravel this mystery in letters, which has so long been the *opprobrium et crux grammaticorum*, the reproach and torment of grammarians.' If we were to apply this language to the whole science of the voice, which it really embraces in its spirit, we might say, that the course and object of Dr Rush's work comes within the range of the prediction. He has, with his 'Philosophical Analysis,' undertaken to give a notation of the speaking voice. It is drawn, as we have already intimated, from the sister art of music, and is founded on the musical scale. This is the most natural resort; since the speaking voice differs from the musical, only in its being concrete, instead of discrete; that is, only in its flowing through the whole scale. But whether Dr Rush shall be that fortunate philosopher, or whether his system, like the notation of gesture laid down in the 'Chironomia,' will not require more attention, than speakers of modern times will give, must be for time and experiment to determine.

Having thus attempted to discharge something of our duty towards the works named at the head of this article, we shall now take up the burden of our original complaint, at the neglect with which this whole subject is treated. Let it be admitted, in the outset, that not one man in ten can or could be eloquent, though we do not believe it; or, if our readers please, that not one in fifty can rise to the highest efforts of oratory. No doubt there is a distinction to be made between agreeable speaking and powerful eloquence; and we make it, *in limine*, because we would not be charged with the extravagance of complaining that the body of our speakers are not eloquent, in the highest sense of the term. It is the agreeable speaking that we ask for, first of all, and most earnestly. Is it not, in fact, through four fifths of every discourse, all that is wanted? Is it not the staple of good oratory? And if it were not, shall a man say that because he cannot speak eloquently, he will not endeavor to speak agreeably? that because he can-

not please in the highest degree, he will take no pains to avoid giving offence? Nor would the distinction turn out to be, in fact, so great as, for the sake of argument, we have admitted it to be, in statement. If men were trained to this art, with half the care that they are to the offices of the counter or the work-bench; if they were trained from their youth to a just, easy, and graceful delivery; if the spell of embarrassment were taken off, and they were 'redeemed, regenerated, and disenthralled;' in one word, if their powers and affections had a free and full manifestation, we believe that the proportion before stated would be reversed, and that the nine would be, at times, truly eloquent, would be interesting at least, and the one only would be inveterately dull. For there is by no means so great a difference among different minds, in regard to sensibility, as is commonly supposed. The difference, much of it, lies in the mode and power of manifestation.

After all, there must, no doubt, be instances of rare and unequalled excellence, such as Cicero has described in his opening, 'De Oratore'; there must be such instances in this art, as well as in statuary or painting. Yet, neither is this altogether a fair comparison. The labors of the sculptor and the painter are far more artificial than those of the orator. The breath of eloquence is in the human soul; the instruments are provided by nature,—the voice, the countenance, the eye, the lips, the hand, the whole frame; and if habit did not make men automatons, and embarrassment did not put a dull mask over 'the human face divine,' the eloquent soul would speak out,—the man could not help being eloquent.

We are aware that we touch a point here, on which some may differ from us, or may think they differ, and therefore we dwell upon it for a moment. There is a mystery about this matter with some, and with others there may be a misunderstanding of our meaning. There are some who regard the eloquent man as a kind of immediate creation from the Almighty. They say that a man is 'born an orator,' and that it is in vain for any man to strive for excellence in the art, who is not made for it. If by this it is meant that eloquence is a peculiar gift, distinguishable from all the other powers of the human mind, we differ from such an opinion entirely. But if it be meant only, that a man is born an orator just as he is born a mathematician, a philosopher, or a statesman, we have no objection to offer to this position. It confirms what we have

been saying. There are natural differences among men, but it is none the less necessary that they should use study and effort ; and this difference is not, in other cases, construed into a discouragement from study and effort.

The comparison just made, may also help us to make our meaning understood. There are but few men who can be statesmen or philosophers of the highest order ; but there are many of various degrees of excellence, to whom we apply these titles. Let it be so with orators ; and let it not be said that because only one in a century can rise to the highest sphere, therefore but one has any call to exertion. Or if any one choose to understand by eloquence, the loftiest pitch of excellence, we will not dispute about a word ; let us then, we say, have good speaking ; and good speaking, we are sure, will pass oftener than men expect, into eloquent speaking. All that we are anxious for is, that no mystical or unphilosophical ideas of eloquence should prevent men from cultivating the powers they have, and from availing themselves of the noble opportunities that are offered to them in this country. For, look abroad through this goodly land of free and intelligent communities, with its thronged schools, and academies, and colleges, with the most popular institutions in the world, with its theatre for oratory in every town-meeting, with its churches, and tribunals of justice, and halls of legislation,—and tell us why eloquence may not flourish here ; why its elder glories may not be revived among us. We are accustomed to say, and not without reason, that this country offers the fairest field in the modern world for the culture of eloquence. Nor have men lost their eagerness to witness the displays of this divine art. There is nothing, in ordinary times, that will draw such multitudes together, or transport them with such enthusiasm. They actually feel, that is, the multitude, as if there were something divine, something like inspiration, in the inexplicable and overwhelming powers of a great orator. They are ready, like those who listened to the ‘Oration’ of Herod, but not with the same venal feeling, to exclaim, ‘It is the voice of a god!’ We well remember, in the days of our boyhood, when our fathers and seniors had been up to the distant City, and talked to us, on their return, of the eloquence of Hamilton, that we caught from them an impression of wonder and delight, bordering almost upon supernatural awe and admiration.

If any one would judge of the estimation in which this glo-

rious gift is held, let him observe how the least approaches to it are received ; how a fine voice, or a prurient imagination, like charity, will cover up a multitude of sins against taste, and reason, and truth ; how the most absolute dearth of thought, or the most barren commonplace, will be forgiven, will escape the notice even of cultivated audiences, if it wear the veil of an elegant delivery ; how—we had almost named names—but how men of the most ordinary talents will make a sensation wherever they go, and collect crowds, not of the weak alone, but of the wise also, to hear them ; nay, how dignified senators, the ‘most potent, grave, and reverend seigniors’ of the nation, will sit as if they were fastened to their seats, and listen by the hour to the most trifling anecdotes, to the most irrelevant stories, when delivered with the ease, and grace, and charm of finished oratory. Indeed, in this matter we grow skeptical about the authority of our (by turns) most wise Hamlet. ‘The judicious’ do *not* ‘grieve’ ; but they smile, and listen,—and listen, and look grave, and say it is very ‘good talk.’ And the multitude—it is indeed a ‘gaping multitude,’ and ready to swallow anything that comes in the shape of rhetoric. They are hungering and thirsting for it. They are lifting up their souls for it,—to the pulpit, to the bar, to the senate-chamber. They are ready to be instructed, to be moved, aroused, transported ; yes, the most obstinate are willing to be enlightened, the most obdurate to be melted, the dullest to be charmed, if the power and the wisdom come in the form of eloquence.

‘The field is white to the harvest’ (not irreverently to make the application), but where are the laborers ? Indeed, ‘the laborers are few.’ Some eloquent men there are in this country ; eloquent from the simple force of talent, from the irrepressible burstings forth of genius, on great themes and occasions ; eloquent, because they cannot help it. But anything like settled, concentrated, patient effort, for improvement in oratory ; anything like an effort, running through the whole course of education, renewed with every day as the great object, pursued into the discharge of professional duties, is scarcely known among us. The mass of our public speakers would as soon think of taking up some mechanical trade as a subsidiary occupation of life, as they would think of adopting Cicero’s practice of daily declamations. They would be ashamed, like the member of Parliament, mentioned by Ches-

terfield, and very properly justified by him, of being *caught* in any practice of this sort. The art of speaking well, seems to be thought a trifling or an unworthy art. Or, is it that most extraordinary desire that prevails so much among our speakers and writers, to have it supposed that their best and most successful efforts cost them little or no preparation?

Whatever be the cause of this general neglect, the consequence is plain enough. *The making of good sentences*, the first business of a public speaker, seems, by most of our legislative debaters and forensic orators, to be least of all understood. Violations of sense, of the structure of sentences, nay, and of grammar, too, are constantly witnessed. It is really perilous to listen. We are in perpetual terror lest the speaker should make shipwreck of all reason and sense. As he rises on the wave of some swelling period, our own minds partake of his insecurity to such an extent, that we lose all thoughts of his subject, in sympathy for his situation.

It fares no better with our discourses, than with our sentences. Alas! what would Father Quintilian and Dr Hugh Blair say, if they could listen to some of our speeches? The most solemn rules about the exordium, narration, statement, argument, peroration,—about the order, progress, climax of a discourse,—about the consistency of metaphors, with themselves and with the subject,—about figures, comparison, vision, hyperbole, are scarcely more regarded among us, than if those venerable personages had never lived.

And then, what a variety of gesture have we, from the arms, that sail about like the arms of a wind-mill, and with as little meaning, to the more common sawing, and hammering, and punching, that suggest a doubt whether the man was not brought up to a different trade from that of speaking. And so it is with the other organs of the speaker. The countenance is dull, or distorted. The voice is harsh and vociferous, or feeble, or drawling and monotonous, and comes out with a languid and reluctant effort, as if the alternative were to ‘speak or die.’ And the eye,—we refer now to the pulpit,—the eye wanders upon vacancy, or gazes strenuously upon nothing, or is fixed intently and sedulously upon the cushion, as if it were that ‘Velvet Cushion,’ which teemed with wondrous thoughts to the attentive Vicar; or the same organ, being lifted up, instantly seeks some pillar or post, on which it may conveniently rest itself. We almost wish, indeed, that those great boxes,

called pulpits, with their many props and appliances for indolence and dulness, were hewn down, dismantled, and destroyed. Seriously, our only difficulty would be to find a place for the *incumbent*, and for his manuscripts; and this we should do by arranging a bare platform, and a simple low reading-desk. For we would not have the manuscripts rashly given up, though they are undoubtedly an obstruction oftentimes to the zeal of the preacher. No man can ever do full justice to his powers, who always literally follows his written page. But it requires a much more thorough training than our preachers yet have had, to venture much upon extemporaneous delivery. On this subject we would earnestly commend to our clergy, a little book from one of their brethren,* intitled ‘Hints on Extemporaneous Preaching;’ a book which, in some portions of it, illustrates the eloquence it recommends.

It may be thought that we have indulged somewhat in caricature; but on this subject we are certain that no strength of language can be too great. No caricature, no extravagance, nor ridicule can come up to the absurdity of expecting to speak well, on the slight preparation which is commonly made,—or that which is provided for, in fact, in our systems of education,—for this noble exercise. There may be, of lawyers, clergymen, and others, probably twenty thousand public speakers in this country. We do not believe that, on an average, they have each spent ten weeks of preparation, for this most important part of their professional duties. The orator, with the ancients, was held to be the perfection, the *beau idéal*, of a man. They directed that all the powers of their noble youth should be concentrated to the attainment of this character. But that training of all the faculties to this great accomplishment; that various study, all with reference to this end; that sedulous culture of the memory, the judgment, and the fancy, as the polished instruments of eloquence; that laying in of the stores of learning and the treasures of history for its use; that patient, constant, daily practice of reading and speaking; and, at last, that summoning up of all that was strong, and beautiful, and accomplished, and treasured in the mind, to the great endeavor,—that almost godlike sway and mastery over human hearts, at which they aimed;—all this, we seem as little

* The Rev. Henry Ware, Jr., lately appointed Professor of Pulpit Eloquence and the Pastoral Care, in the Theological School, Cambridge.

to think of, as if it were detailed in the stories of old romance. Compared with those free and noble spirits, we are content to be slaves, and to wear chains. And yet we are speakers, forsooth, and we talk about eloquence; or we are passing through courses of study preparatory to an appearance before the public; and occasions and subjects that stir up all the passions of the soul are offered to us; the high claims of justice are to be pleaded; the great interests of the nation are to be discussed; the tremendous ‘powers of the world to come,’ if we may speak so, are to be wielded; and yet the chain is upon us, the chain of mechanical habit, or slavish timidity; the arm moves constrainedly in its socket; there is a leaden weight upon the tongue, and a film upon the eye, that should flash forth the fires of the soul; opportunities nobler than those of heroism are unimproved; the temple of justice but rarely yields inspiration; the public councils are tedious; and the pulpit,—that new and nobler field of eloquence,—even the pulpit, where man should put forth a more awful power, than when Demosthenes ‘fulmin’d over Greeee,’ is proverbially dull!

But what can be done? This is the question which we shall now attempt to answer. We shall speak with earnestness and confidence; and if there shall seem to be anything positive and dictatorial in our suggestions, we must be excused, on the ground, that, to our minds, the case is as clear as it is cogent.

We observe, then, in general, that this great aim—to speak well—must pervade the whole course of education; we mean the education of those who are designed to be public speakers. We would not fall a whit behind the demands of the ancient rhetoricians in this respect. We would have it said to our youth, ‘You must study, learn, acquire, comprehend, compass everything, with reference to that end. Your acquisitions are all to be put to that use. Your learning may indeed be valuable to yourselves on its own account; but of what value can it be to others, unless you learn to communicate it? Without this aim, you are acting as absurdly as the merchant’s clerk, who should always be poring over ‘Anderson’s Commerce,’ or treatises on commercial law, and never gaining any acquaintance with trade; or as the apprentice, who should busy himself with studying the principles of mechanics, and never make himself acquainted with tools. If you were destined for the anchorite’s cell, it would be enough for you *to know*; but

if you are coming forth upon the theatre of life, for what are you to come? Is it to fold your arms, or worse, to have them pinioned to your sides? and to have every power that you are cultivating, disenabled and rendered useless? No; it is for action, that you are to come forth; and the action, if you are to be public speakers, is to be emphatically that, under which the old orators comprehended the whole body and soul of eloquence.' There never was a collection of youth that more needed to have this said to them, and urged upon them, than the youth of our colleges. There is talent enough, and hard study enough, perhaps; but there is no sufficient feeling of the great relation to active life; nothing like that which must have been awakened in the schools of ancient eloquence; nothing like that which must have animated the ardent youth that waited on the steps of Cicero, as he bent his way to the Roman forum. For want of this, the secluded and silent cells of our colleges are often the graves of genius, rather than its nurseries. We might almost apply, without parody, the words of Gray to them;

'Some village Hampden, with his dauntless breast,

* * * * *

Some mute inglorious Milton here may rest,

Some Cromwell, guiltless of his country's blood.

Th' applause of listening senates to command,

The threats of pain and ruin to despise,

To scatter plenty o'er a smiling land,

And read their history in a nation's eyes,'

does 'their lot' forbid it? No; but their minds do not grasp it. We speak with feelings at the farthest possible remove from disrespect or scorn. We speak, it is true, more from recollection than from actual observation. But we remember how it was, and we suspect it is too much so still. We remember in what insensibility we passed that period of our lives, of all that was to be done and dared in the world. And there is another trait in our learned institutions, which many among us may probably be able to call to vivid remembrance, if they do not still observe it. There was, and there is, we believe, something, shall we call it, of a stoic or of a monastic spirit, in our colleges, with regard to learning. There was among us, we well remember, a feeling, that it was enough *to know*; that knowledge was to be valued singly and solely for itself; that the only worthy ambition was to be thorough scholars;

there was, in some of the best and noblest minds, an almost stern and scornful feeling towards all exhibition, or desire of exhibition. In this feeling, it was very naturally forgotten, that the ultimate object, after all, is exhibition ; and that all learning and genius, but to their possessor, are useless without it. We have often thought that it would have been of great service to us, if we had, at that period, read the Letters of Lord Chesterfield to his Son. We recommend not their spirit ; their worldliness, we mean,—for the taint of licentiousness is a thing that only appears here and there, and does by no means infect the volumes as deeply as is commonly supposed. But the uselessness of all talents and acquisitions, without the power of exhibition, is set forth, with a variety, pith, wit, and earnestness, to say nothing of an almost unequalled style, that would make them a valuable lesson to our young men.

From this general observation on the place which eloquence should hold among the objects of education, let us descend to particulars.

The business of training our youth to this accomplishment must be commenced in childhood. The first school is the nursery. There, at least, may be formed a distinct articulation, which is the first requisite for good speaking. How rarely is it found in perfection among our orators ! Words, says one, referring to articulation, should ‘ be delivered out from the lips, as beautiful coins, newly issued from the mint ; deeply and accurately impressed, perfectly finished, neatly struck by the proper organs, distinct, in due succession and of due weight.’* How rarely do we hear a speaker whose tongue, teeth, and lips, do their office so perfectly as in any wise to answer to this beautiful description. And the common faults in articulation, it should be remembered, take their rise from the very nursery. But let us refer to other particulars.

Grace in eloquence,—in the pulpit, at the bar,—cannot be separated from grace in the ordinary manners, in private life, in the social circle, in the family. It cannot be put on with the *toga civilis*. It cannot well be superinduced upon all the other acquisitions of youth, any more than that nameless, but invaluable quality, called good breeding. You may, therefore, begin the work of forming the orator with your child ; not merely by teaching him to declaim, but, what is of much more conse-

* Chironomia.

quence, by observing and correcting his daily manners, motions, and attitudes. You can say, when he comes into your apartment, or presents you with something, a book or letter, in an awkward and blundering manner, ‘Just return, and enter this room again,’ or, ‘Present me that book in a different manner,’ or, ‘Put yourself into a different attitude.’ You can explain to him the difference between thrusting or pushing out his hand and arm in straight lines and at acute angles, and moving it in flowing, circular lines, and easy, graceful action. He will readily understand you. Nothing is more true than that ‘the motions of children are originally graceful ;’ and it is by suffering them to be perverted, that we lay the foundation for invincible awkwardness in later life.

We go next to the schools for children. It ought to be a leading object in these schools to teach the art of reading. It ought to occupy three-fold more time than it does. The teachers of these schools should labor to improve *themselves*. They should feel, that to them, for a time, are committed the future orators of the land. We had rather have a child, even of the other sex, return to us from school, a first-rate reader, than a first-rate performer on the piano-forte. We should feel that we had a far better pledge for the intelligence and talent of our child. The accomplishment, in its perfection, would give more pleasure. The voice of song is not sweeter than the voice of eloquence. And there may be eloquent readers, as well as eloquent speakers. We speak of perfection in this art ; and it is something, we must say in defence of our preference, which we have never yet seen. Let the same pains be devoted to reading, as are required to form an accomplished performer on an instrument ; let us have our *phonasci*, as the ancients had,—the formers of the voice, the music-masters of the reading voice ; let us see years devoted to this accomplishment, and then we should be prepared to stand the comparison. It is, indeed, a most intellectual accomplishment. So is music, too, in its perfection. We do, by no means, undervalue this noble and most delightful art ; to which Socrates applied himself even in his old age. But one recommendation of the art of reading is, that it requires a constant exercise of mind. It demands continual and close reflection and thought, and the finest discrimination of thought. It involves, in its perfection, the whole art of criticism on language. A man may possess a fine genius without being a perfect reader ; but he cannot be a perfect reader without genius.

Let us now advance some steps higher, to our colleges. We mean no disrespect to their guardians, and certainly not to their officers (whose duties are appointed to them), in what we are about to say. But we do entertain a full and entire conviction, and experience, observation, the actual result, warrant us in a full conviction, of the absolute futility of the attempts hitherto made, for training up the youth of our colleges to be accomplished advocates, debaters, and preachers. We remember to have asked an intelligent rhetorical professor in one of our colleges, what he was doing to make his pupils good speakers ; and his answer was, that he was beginning to think, nothing could be done. And we are persuaded that nothing can be done, till a great deal more is done. The case craves more thorough dealing than it has yet had, or it may as well be given up as hopeless. We are inclined to believe, that we had rather take our chance with a speaker, who had never declaimed in his life, who had never heard of a gesture, than with the body of those who have had the training of our colleges. It seems to us as true of eloquence, as of philosophy, that ‘a little learning is a dangerous thing.’ There is a homely proverb, that ‘men should beware how they handle edged tools.’ We think that tones, inflections, gestures, are such things. There are three states of the manners ; a native and crude simplicity ; next, the awkwardness and constraint of a man, introduced, but not accustomed to a public situation or a polished society, and trying to put on manners for the occasion ; and, finally, the ease, grace, and self-possession of the finished gentleman. And there are the same states in the manners of the public speaker. Now what we say, is, that if we cannot have the last of these, we should prefer the first.

It may be thought that we are saying bold things, and that we shall have few to agree with us. Let, then, these suggestions pass for the opinions of a few, or of less than a few. We are certain at least that we should have the old orators to agree with us. If Cicero were to rise among us, what would he think of the means and methods we use to form the orator ? If Quintilian were to write again, he would find occasion to put with a new and satirical meaning, the apparently simple question, ‘whether rhetoric be an art.’ Another of his questions, he might think it almost indecorous to discuss among us ; namely, ‘whether rhetoric be a virtue.’ It, certainly, is both ; and yet we treat it, as if it were neither ; or, at least, as if it were a

virtue, an art, so very low, as to be worthy only of a casual, intermitted, and inefficient cultivation.

For, what, we pray, is done, and under what circumstances? Possessed with innumerable bad habits of speaking, laden with blunders that have been accumulating through fifteen years, the boy is sent to college. What is done for him there? He is required to declaim five or ten minutes, once in a month, or once in two months. One, two, or three weeks pass over him (this is ordinarily the fact) without his thinking of the matter but to dread it; without his once opening his lips, in private, to declaim, or to do anything for his improvement in this most important branch of his education,—anything to prepare himself for the principal use of his powers as an educated and professional man. This, we think, we might take for granted, if we did not know it to be, generally, the fact. This, the corporations of our colleges are bound to take for granted, because they have no reason to suppose that anything is regularly and effectually done, which is not required to be done. Take the most interesting study pursued at college; and if a recitation were required only once in a fortnight, or a month, we know that, generally, nothing more would be done than to prepare for it.

Once in a month, then, (this is probably a fair average) the pupil is called upon to declaim, before his teacher and his fellow-students. As the time approaches, he casts about him for a passage for declamation; he commits it imperfectly to memory, rather than studies it; he repeats it to himself, silently or aloud, a few times, and then goes forward to the trial. From beginning to end, it is an irksome business. It is a thing by the by; it is a hasty preparation; it is a feverish effort; and in the trial, the whole power of the individual is often taken up, with recollecting, or with striving to keep down his embarrassment, or with trying to appear not awkward, in which he but ill succeeds. Then come the terrors of criticism; he stands like a criminal before his judges; he quits the stage, as an accused man does the bar of trial, and feels only more comfortably than the culprit, inasmuch as he is not going to jail. For he is condemned, or let off as not worth criticism; he is condemned, or feels that he ought to be; condemned by himself, if not by his tutor; he feels that he has done no justice to his own conceptions, and he retires, mortified and ashamed. We know, that we are describing many and many a case, if

not every one. And the exemption, where it exists, is seldom fairly earned. There are those who are more confident, and more satisfied with themselves, but seldom with good reason. It is impossible, with the time and pains and means commonly used for accomplishment in this art, that the ingenuous learner, the noble aspirant, should do anything that ought to satisfy him.

We have spoken of the terrors of criticism. This *fear* is the pest and bane of good speaking in all our colleges. To our youthful orators, everything is wanting if they have not freedom. But they are made the slaves of criticism. And what, we ask, is to do away this fear, so long as the highest and most difficult of all arts, the most varied, exquisite, and comprehensive of all the exercises of talent, receives so little attention? What but familiarity with a task like this, can beget freedom in it? We do not know of a more comprehensive sentence with which the author of '*Hints on Extemporaneous Preaching*,' could have closed his little work, than that of Goldsmith, in which these two requisites and pledges of success are stated; namely, to '*feel the subject thoroughly, and to speak without fear.*' Let us, while these pages are in mind, make an extract from them in connexion with our present remarks.

'If any one would sing, he attends a master, and is drilled in the very elementary principles; and only after the most laborious process, dares to exercise his voice in public. This he does, though he has scarce anything to learn but the mechanical execution of what lies in sensible forms before his eye.' 'If he were learning to play on the flute for public exhibition, what hours and days would he spend in giving facility to his fingers, and attaining the power of the sweetest and most impressive execution. If he were devoting himself to the organ, what months and years would he labor, that he might know its compass, and be master of its keys, and be able to draw out, at will, all its various combinations of harmonious sound, and its full richness and delicacy of expression. And yet he will fancy that the grandest, the most various, the most expressive of all instruments, which the Creator has fashioned by the union of an intellectual soul with the powers of speech, may be played upon without study or practice; he comes to it, a mere uninstructed tyro, and thinks to manage all its stops, and command the whole compass of its varied and comprehensive power! He finds himself a bungler in the attempt, is mortified at his failure, and settles it in his mind for ever, that the attempt is vain.' pp. 59-61.

We cannot resist adding to this, the following extract from Dr Rush, a line or two of which we hope our college instructors will pardon, in consideration of the general truth and pith of the paragraph.

‘Go to some, may I say all, of our colleges and universities, and observe how the art of speaking is not taught there. See a boy of but fifteen years, sent upon the stage, pale and choking with apprehension, in an attempt to do that, without instruction, which he came purposely to learn, and to furnish amusement to his class-mates, by a pardonable awkwardness, which should be punished in the person of his pretending and neglectful preceptors, with little less than scourging. Then visit a *conservatorio* of music ; see the orderly tasks, the masterly discipline, the unwearied superintendence, and the incessant toil to produce accomplishment of voice ;—and afterwards do not be surprised that the pulpit, the senate, the bar, and the chair of medical professorship are filled with such abominable drawlers, mouthers, mumblers, clutterers, squeakers, chanters, and mongers in monotony ; nor that the schools of singing are constantly sending abroad those great instances of vocal wonder, who sound along the high places of the world ; who are bidden to the halls of fashion and wealth ; who sometimes quell the pride of rank by its momentary sensation of envy ; and who draw forth the intelligent curiosity, and produce the crowning delight and approbation of the prince and the sage.’ pp. 489, 490.

But, to return ; how unavoidable is it, that this ‘uninstructed tyro,’ should be ‘mortified,’ and disheartened. How can it be otherwise than that agitation and fear should take possession of his mind ? How could the pupil in music, after a number of imperfect lessons, taken at ‘odd times,’ and irregular intervals, bear to come before a great audience, with his crude performance ? He would be more than a mortal man, or, certainly, more than a modest one, not to fear. The situation of a public speaker is as trying, as his task is great. He who has scarcely acquired ease and freedom in private society, with no other responsibility than to behave with propriety, or to make himself agreeable, is to rise up in the presence of a great assembly ; the only object of attention ; the only voice listened to, his ;—himself, environed with the eyes of hundreds. It must require laborious, assiduous, long continued preparation to meet a situation like this, with an unfaltering tongue, a calm eye, and an unshaken nerve. Without such a preparation, it is a species of cruelty to force upon a man duties like these. We

say to the speaker, or should say, if we dealt frankly with him, 'You did not seem at ease; you did not give us your eye steadily; you used no action, or you made gestures that meant nothing; you were cold and dull; you ought to have electrified your audience, in such a part of your discourse; you should let out your feelings; you should give up your whole soul to what you are saying; it should hang upon your lips, it should beam from your eye, it should thrill your whole frame;'—all which is about as wise, as if we said it to the slave. How can a man, and be a man, discharge the highest and noblest function in the world, with less training than is required for the most common occupation in life? how can he do this, and do it without distrust, embarrassment, and awkwardness? The spell that binds and paralyzes all the faculties, is *fear*, and nothing can shake it off but studious practice. Even familiarity will not do it. For the speaker, without study, without an intelligent and persevering aim, may become familiarized but to constraint, and apathy, and despair; familiarized to that palsy, which will never more permit him to put forth the vigor of his faculties.

We have already ventured in part upon the implication, that our college exercises in declamation do more hurt, than good. The truth is, they leave the pupil, just in that position between rudeness and accomplishment, that constitutes awkwardness; that makes him feeble without grace, and stiff without vigor. They do just enough to discourage him; just enough to make him feel his deficiencies; just enough to create the feeling, so natural to lingering but unsuccessful efforts, that he never can exert his powers in this way. Any observer may often see a plain man, earnestly talking in the streets, or speaking in a town-meeting with a glow of countenance and a propriety of gesture, which he might well wish to see transferred to the pulpit or the bar. And better, than to require these occasional and inefficient declamations, better were it, perhaps, to leave the mind to its natural impulses, to leave it, to the great occasions of life, to draw forth a just and powerful oratory.

If there be any force in what we have said, we would most earnestly solicit a hearing for it, from the trustees and guardians of our academies and colleges, and of those higher institutions which are designed to prepare our youth for the pulpit and bar. We humbly suggest to them, whether oratory, as a science and an art, should not be more distinctly recognised in

the plan of a public education ; whether it should not have hours of study and practice appropriated to it ; whether, in fact, it should not occupy as large a space as any other branch in the course of public instruction. We had it in mind before closing our observations, to suggest a project and plan for a School of Oratory in this country. But in truth all our colleges ought to be such schools. There is a great deal to be done. It is one of the miseries of our college exercises in rhetoric, that a great deal of time must be taken up, merely with correcting faults and removing bad habits, before the student can enter, free and disembarassed, the career of great excellence. It is notorious, that but few of our educated young men, when they leave college, are so far advanced even as to be good readers. We see and lament this defect continually in our pulpits ; and we lament it the more, when occasionally in the hands of a skilful reader, the Bible is unfolded to us, almost as a new book. But we leave our suggestions on this point, again earnestly commending them to those, with whom it remains to decide whether we are to go on for years to come, without any essential improvement.

But we cannot leave our public institutions, without taking notice further, of what seems to us the prodigious waste of study and talent, which the present system involves. Here and there a man, from some fortunate direction of his mind, or strong natural propensity, or favorable situation, breaks through the difficulties that keep down other men, and rises to a considerable measure of eloquence, and becomes conspicuous in his neighborhood or in the country at large. But do we not know that there are hundreds of others, whose powers and acquisitions are equal,—who think as clearly, and feel as deeply, but whose talents are buried in comparative obscurity ? who *think* eloquently, who feel that ‘ it is *within* ’ them to address eloquent thoughts to their fellow men, but who can never say, with Sheridan, ‘ *it shall come out* ’ ! It is not for the want of study, that these men, the majority, fail. What years have they spent, and spent all their substance too ; what days of toil, and evenings of patient thought, have they pursued to the midnight hour. The waning lamp has been no romance to them, the fixed brow and the feverish pulse no poetry ; they have toiled, reckless of health and comfort, they have kindled, and rekindled the fire within them, that has wasted away the strength and prime of their youth ; and when they come to the crisis of

their fate, when they stand before the great public, and are put to the trial in which they are to rise or fall, for this world,—they find, alas, that the very office they have there to discharge, is the office which they are least of all prepared for. With all the sciences and arts they have labored to understand, they have never learnt the grand art of communication, the science of speech; with all the languages they have mastered, they have never learnt the language of eloquence; and their acquisitions, their reasonings, the collected wisdom of sages, the gathered lore of centuries, sink to nothing before the pretensions of some flippant declaimer. It is from this cause, no doubt, it is from want of the power of communication, that preachers are often unreasonably charged with dullness. It is not, always, that the *man* is dull; but it is, that being placed in a situation for which he is not properly trained, he sinks into a mechanical habit, from the very inability to give just and natural expression to his emotions. Many and many a sermon has been written (it is not too much to say) with burning tears, and when it came to the delivery, has been struck, as if by magic, with the coldness of death; and he, whose breast glowed with sacred fervor in the closet, has appeared in the pulpit, as a marble statue. May we be permitted, in passing, to suggest to our preachers and public speakers, the propriety, nay, the duty of paying some attention to this subject? We allow that the effort to improve, at this later period, is attended with considerable danger. Some, no doubt, have injured their style of delivery by such an effort. Their manner has become artificial; and they have lost in power, what they have gained in correctness. We venture to point out what we think is the only remedy; and that is, to forget all definitions, rules, and *praxes*, when entering the pulpit or the bar, to have no gestures or tones provided beforehand, but to give ourselves up wholly to the impulse of the occasion, letting whatever improvement there may be in manner, tone, &c. be, at the moment, altogether unpremeditated and insensible. With this precaution, we have no doubt that reading or declamation an hour every day, would be of the most essential service, and would in a single year, if the practice were universal, put almost a new face upon our pulpit and bar.

The labors requisite to form the public speaker are by no means duly appreciated among us; and this is the first great difficulty that lies in the way of our argument. There is

nothing like the ancient estimation of this work. An absurd idea prevails among our scholars, that the finest productions of the mind are the fruits of hasty impulse, the unfoldings of a sudden thought, the brief visitations of a fortunate hour or evening, the flashings of intuition, or the gleamings of fancy. Genius is often compared to lightning from the cloud, or the sudden bursting out of a secret fountain. And eloquence is regarded as if it were a kind of inspiration. When a man has made a happy effort, he is next possessed with an absurd ambition, to have it thought that it cost him nothing. He will say, perhaps, that it was a three hours' work. Now it is not enough to maintain that nothing could be more injurious to our youth, than this way of thinking; for the truth is, that nothing can be more false. The mistake lies, in confounding with the mere arrangement of thoughts, or the manual labor of putting them on paper, the long previous preparation of mind, the settled habits of thought. It has taken but three hours, perhaps, to compose an admirable piece of poetry, or a fine speech; but the reflections of three years, or of thirty, may have been tending to that result. It is a good rule, no doubt, 'to write with fury, and correct with phlegm;' but a man cannot write with fury, and write with sense too, without much previous thought. He may write with folly, and that is often done. He may imagine that he is writing finely, because he is writing fast, and that his sounding pen flies over an inspired page; and that is likely to result from the absurd application of the maxim, that happy efforts are hasty ones. Genius is thought, is study, is application. The two simple, but magic words, which contain the secret of Newton's greatness, according to his own explanation, are 'patient thought.' There is not a more indispensable characteristic of genius than good sense. It is this that has given to the true works of genius, universal reception and immortal fame. And here, too, is indicated the rock, on which thousands have split. Many men have a powerful imagination, but they have not the 'patient thought,' the good sense, requisite to control it. They have not learnt, in 'the very torrent, tempest, and whirlwind of passion, to acquire and beget the *temperance*, that may give it smoothness.' We wish that we could see an analysis of genius on these principles; that we could see unfolded all the previous thought, the patient study, the thorough reflection, the fine discrimination, that are necessary to produce even a page of really fine wri-

ting. It would be a useful lesson. It would teach our aspiring youth, that they never can succeed without labor ; that it never will do to trust to irregular hasty efforts ; that they might as well expect literally to command the lightnings of the tempest without philosophy, as without philosophy to wield the lightnings of eloquence. They ought not to have this power without laboring for it, without waiting patiently at the shrine of that divinity,—the Industry, which alone can give it. The gift is too great, too high, to cost them little.

But this is a point, which deserves to be considered by itself,—the greatness of the art. To give the noblest thoughts the noblest expression ; to stand up in the pure light of reason, or to create a new atmosphere, as it were, for intellectual vision ; to put on all the glories of imagination, as a garment ; to penetrate the soul, and to make men feel as if they were themselves new creatures, to make them conscious of new powers and a new being ; to exercise, in the loftiest measure, the only glorious and godlike sway, that over willing minds ; to fill the ear, the eye, the inmost soul, with sounds, and images, and holy visions of beauty and grandeur ; to make truth and justice, to make wisdom and virtue and religion, more lovely and majestic things, than men had ever thought them before ; to delight, as well as to convince ; to charm, to fascinate, to win, to arouse, to calm, to terrify, to overwhelm,—this is the work of eloquence ; and it is a glorious work.

The great object of all the liberal arts is to exhibit the mind ; to exhibit character, thought, feeling, in their various aspects. In this consists all their power and sublimity. For this, the painter spreads upon the dull canvass the breathing forms of life ; the sculptor causes the marble to speak ; the architect models the fair and majestic structure, with sublimity enthroned in its dome, with beauty shaped in its columns, and glory written upon its walls ; and the poet builds his lofty rhyme ; and the eloquent in music, orders his movement and combination of sweet sounds. But, of this mind, the human frame is the appointed instrument. It was designed for this end. For it could have answered all the purposes of physical existence, without any of its present grace and beauty. It was made with no more obvious intent, than to be the expression of mind, the organ of the soul, the vehicle of thought. And when all its powers are put in requisition for this purpose,—the voice with all its thrilling tones ; the eye, ‘through which, as a window,

the soul darts forth its light'; the lips, on which 'grace is poured'; the whole glowing countenance, the whole breathing frame, which, in their ordinary forms, can express more than the majesty of an Apollo, more than the agony of a Laocoon;—when every motion speaks, every lineament is more than the written line of genius, every muscle swells with the inspiration of high thoughts, every nerve is swayed to the movings of some mighty theme;—what instrument of music, what glories of the canvass, can equal it? Eloquence is the combination of all arts, and it excels them all in their separate powers. Nor is it confined to the mere gratification of taste. The great and ultimate object of social existence, is for man to act on man; and eloquence is the grandest medium of this action. It is not only the highest perfection of a human being (for 'the orator must be a *good* man') but it is that perfection in act. It is sublimity, beauty, genius, power, in their most glorious exercise.

Eloquence, it is often said, is the peculiar attribute of man. But more than this is true. It belongs to humanity. The human soul is eloquent, whenever and wherever it has a full developement. Its signatures are divine; and where they are seen, they cannot fail to leave their impression. It is one of the maxims with which we have no patience, that the English character is not fitted for an earnest delivery; that eloquence will not flourish on this stock; that there is something in our temperament or taste that forbids it. The English mind not eloquent! We might as well say, that it is possessed of no strong feelings or noble thoughts. For if it has these, and has them, in fact, in uncommon strength, has it not a language, a voice, a countenance, a free and unfettered arm, 'the weapon of the orator,' to express them? It is true, that our taste may not be altogether so favorable as it ought to be; a dull, prudish, perverse taste. It is true that our ordinary manners in this country have not the desirable ease and freedom; there is newness, embarrassment, awkwardness, constraint, in them; they are not so free and forcible, and not so indicative of the free workings of the mind, as they ought to be. But these, after all, are rather the manners of ceremony, and of formal society. Go to the exchange, the market, the public street, the municipal meeting, and you shall see, that the men, in whose veins English blood is flowing, can be ardent and earnest, and can use action, though they do not know it; and that is the right action. Go up to the greater

occasions of life, to the crowded and grave assembly, and our Burke, and Sheridan, and Chatham, and our own Ames, and Hamilton, and Emmet, and the names of the living among us, that rise to our thoughts, are sufficient to wipe away the stigma; that we are so willing to fasten upon ourselves; sufficient to show that our court-room and our debating-hall are not always tedious, and that our pulpit is not always dull.

It is another maxim, as little to be endured, that oratory must decline with the progress of knowledge and refinement; that the age of eloquence is, in fact, passing away from us. We believe it not, any more than we believe that the age of thought and feeling is passing away. It is a shallow maxim, arising from an imperfect development of mind, which is too often mistaken for refinement and decided improvement, when it is only the crude, fermenting process, that is leading to improvement. Is the mind to grow feeble, as it advances? Is feeling to lose its intensity in true refinement? Is truth to be less interesting, because error is detected? or simplicity to be less divine or mighty, because exaggeration has ceased to move us? Is the soul to be bereft of its energy, or shorn of its brightness, as it emerges to light, and rises to sublimity? Some of the awakening themes of eloquence may pass away with those occasions of tyranny, oppression, and danger, that create them. Enough of these, however, are likely to remain. But others will open, more glorious and majestic than these. These, too, will arise in new forms, so long as wickedness and misery prevail in the earth. We have as yet broken down only some of the outward barriers, in the way to social and individual happiness. There are other and more formidable enemies to be met in the great struggle for human welfare. The single evil of intemperance is as powerful a call for eloquence, as the most oppressive tyranny that ever cursed the earth. Heaven grant that there never may be occasion for 'Philippics' in this free land. But there will be occasion for arguments, invectives, warnings, and all the arousing and pleading voices of eloquence, for many and many long years, before the united energies of this nation shall have wrought out that happy state, to which the patriot and the philanthropist are looking. It is, indeed, an immense and glorious field; and we trust that it is to be cultivated, with labors such as have not yet been seen among us. We look for future orators in this land, whose words of might shall shake its wide and utmost

borders, shall resound from the Atlantic to the 'Pacific seas'; and whose renown shall be the heritage of distant generations. We trust that a voice is to arise in this Western world, which shall echo to the glorious eloquence of ancient times.

ART. III.—1. *Œuvres de Platon*. Traduites par VICTOR COUSIN. Vol. I—V. 8vo. Paris. 1822–8.

2. *Fragmens Philosophiques*. Par le même. 8vo. Paris. 1826.

3. *Cours de Philosophie*. Par M. V. COUSIN, Professeur de Philosophie à la Faculté de Lettres de Paris. 8vo. Paris. 1828.

4. *Nouveaux Fragmens Philosophiques*. Par le même. 8vo. 1828.

A FAITHFUL and elegant translation of the works of Plato would be one of the most acceptable presents of a literary kind, that could be made to the English public. That of Taylor, the only one we have, though complete, is written in so barbarous a style as to be wholly illegible; and those celebrated Dialogues, which, independently of their beauty as literary works, are immeasurably curious and valuable as the authentic contemporary reports of the lessons of Socrates, the Gospel, as it were, of the first pure and powerful proclamation of natural religion, are still inaccessible to the mere English reader. Until very recently the other modern languages were equally deficient in this respect with ours. The German version of Schleiermacher has been published within a few years, and the French one by Professor Cousin, of which we have now the satisfaction to announce the first volumes, is still unfinished. Should this be completed (as there is every reason to suppose it will be in the course of a year or two), it will in a great measure supply the defect of which we complain, though in a manner less honorable than we could have wished, to our own contemporary literature. An acquaintance with the French language is, however, so general, that most persons who would be capable of enjoying Plato in an English dress, will not probably find him much less familiar in the elegant Pa-